

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Status

Claims 1 and 3-20 are pending. Claim 2 is canceled. Claims 1, 4, 7 and 13 are currently amended. Amended claims 1, 7 and 13 now include component (A-1) and its corresponding parts by mass which finds support in the specification: page 26, lines 20-25; page 46, line 21, to page 47, line 6; and page 66, lines 12-19. Amended claim 1 also includes the subject matter of original claim 2. Claim 4 is amended for grammatical purposes and to improve readability. No new matter has been entered.

Abstract Objection

A replacement Abstract limited to a single paragraph and within the preferred range of 50 to 150 words is provided herein. Withdrawal of this objection is requested.

§102(b) Rejections

Claims 1-3, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by *Hirai* (US 6,664,313). Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by *Hiroshi* (JP 2003-176367). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Hirai discloses a polycarbonate resin composition comprising 100 parts by weight of an aromatic polycarbonate resin, and 3 to 30 parts by weight of titanium oxide (Abstract; claim 1). *Hirai* also generically discloses preferred aromatic polycarbonate resins as being “derived from 2,2-bis(4-hydroxyphenyl)propane and the polycarbonate polymers derived from 2,2-bis(4-hydroxyphenyl)propane and other aromatic dihydroxyl compounds”, possibly having a copolymerized siloxane structure, and possibly being “a mixture of two or more types of aromatic polycarbonate resin differing in composition, molecular weight, etc.” (col. 2, line 57, to col. 3, line 2).

Hiroshi discloses a light reflecting sheet comprising a composition of a thermoplastic resin of 38 to 91.5 wt% polycarbonate resin and a filler of 8.5 to 62 wt% titanium oxide ([0010], [0012], [0013]).

In contrast to both *Hirai* and *Hiroshi*, the claimed light reflection sheets (independent claims 1, 7 and 13) comprise a polycarbonate resin composition comprising 60 to 85 mass% of (A) a polycarbonate base polymer and 15 to 40 mass% of (B) titanium oxide, wherein (A) comprises (A-1) a polycarbonate-polyorganosiloxane copolymer and (A-1) is 10 to 58 parts by mass per 100 parts by mass of the total of (A) and (B). As *Hirai* and *Hiroshi* are both silent with respect to such a polycarbonate resin composition (see above discussion of their respective disclosures), namely (A) comprising (A-1) and in the specified amount, *Hirai* and *Hiroshi* do not anticipate Applicants' claims.

Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of these rejections.

§103(a) Rejections

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious in view of *Hirai*. Claims 7-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious in view of *Hirai* and *Ekinaka* (US 6,846,567). Claims 7-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious in view of *Hiroshi* and *Ekinaka*. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

In addition to the disclosures of *Hirai* and *Hiroshi* as described above, *Ekinaka* discloses a surface-protected plastic composite material comprising a transparent plastic (e.g., an aromatic polycarbonate resin), a coating layer, and a thermally cured coating layer (Abstract; claim 1; col. 4, line 11, to col. 5, line 55). However, just as *Hirai* and *Hiroshi*, *Ekinaka* is also silent with respect to a polycarbonate resin composition comprising (A) a polycarbonate base polymer which in turn comprises (A-1) a polycarbonate-polyorganosiloxane copolymer in a specified amount. Accordingly, none of *Hirai*, *Hiroshi* or

Ekinaka, alone or in combination, disclose Applicants polycarbonate resin composition as claimed.

Furthermore, none of *Hirai*, *Hiroshi* or *Ekinaka*, alone or in combination, suggest Applicants polycarbonate resin composition as claimed. First, as each of these three references is silent with respect to a polycarbonate resin composition comprising (A) a polycarbonate base polymer which in turn comprises (A-1) a polycarbonate-polyorganosiloxane copolymer in a specified amount, these three references surely can not then be considered suggestive of that which they fall silent on.

Second, Applicants' specification describes that when component (A-1) is contained in the polycarbonate resin composition in an amount less than the preferred range (i.e., 10-58 parts by mass per 100 parts by mass of the total of (A) and (B)), the polyorganosiloxane is deteriorated in dispersibility and inferior flame retardancy is obtained (page 26, line 20, to page 27, line 5). In contrast, when component (A-1) is contained in the polycarbonate resin composition in an amount satisfying the preferred range (i.e., 10-58 parts by mass per 100 parts by mass of the total of (A) and (B)), a light reflection sheet having a superior flame retardancy is obtained (page 27, lines 5-8). Accordingly, in addition to *Hirai's*, *Hiroshi's* and *Ekinaka's* silence with respect to a polycarbonate resin composition comprising (A) a polycarbonate base polymer which in turn comprises (A-1) a polycarbonate-polyorganosiloxane copolymer in a specified amount, these references do not disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed light reflection sheets having the superior flame retardancy as described above.


Thus, none of *Hirai*, *Hiroshi* or *Ekinaka*, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest Applicants polycarbonate resin composition as claimed. Therefore Applicants request withdrawal of these rejections.

Conclusion

For the reasons discussed above, Applicants submit that all now-pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the objection and rejections and passage of this case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon



Justine M. Wilbur
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 59,678

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)